IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 8038 of 1997

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

==========

1 Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2 To be referred to the Reporter or not ?

3 Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4 Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?

5 Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

SHAMALBHAI P VANKAR - Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT & 3 - Respondents

==========

Appearance :
MR PV HATHI for Petitioner : 1,
GOVERNMENT PLEADER for Respondents : 1 - 2.
MS PREETI S PARMAR for Respondents : 3,
MR SV PARMAR for Respondent : 3,
MR CJ VIN for Respondent : 4,

==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

Date : 20/07/2007

ORAL JUDGMENT

1. Shri Hathi, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner, Shri

S.P.Vanker belonging to Scheduled Caste Community has filed the present petition for getting deemed date of promotion in the cadre of Assistant Conservator of Forests and for consequent change in the Seniority List of Assistant Conservators of Forests of 1993. It is also alleged in the petition that because of his later promotion and non-inclusion of name at proper place in the said Seniority List, he could not enter into the zone of consideration for promotion to the higher post of Deputy Conservator of Forests and that the Roster point for reserved vacancies is not maintained by the State Government.

2. Shri P.V.Hathi, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that the petitioner has retired from service on 31.5.2006 pending this petition and that the Government of Gujarat has issued revised Seniority List of Assistant Conservator of Forests on 5.5.2005 and the said Seniority List is already challenged in several petitions which are pending in this Hon'ble Court being Special Civil Application Nos. 16144/2005, 23193 of 2005 etc.

3. In that view of the matter, the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this petition while reserving his right to file a petition and raise all available grievances either in those petitions and/or after those petitions are heard

and decided by this Court.

4. The permission to withdraw this petition as sought for is granted. The petition stands disposed of as withdrawn. Rule discharged. There shall be no order as to costs.

(S.R.BRAHMBHATT, J.)

pallav